Vol. XIII, No. 3 OCTOBER, 1954

S.F.T.S
LIBRARY

THE REFORMED THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

CONTENTS

Page

THEOLOGY AND EXEGESIS 65
By the Rev. C. S. Petrie, B.A., B.D., Stawell, Vic.

THE ENGLISH ACCOMMODATIONIST THINKERS 75
By the Rev. Professor D. Hopkirk, M.A., B.D., B.Litt., Ph.D., Ormond College, University of Melbourne.

BOOK REVIEWS 85
(See list on inside of back cover)

PRICE: TWO SHILLINGS AND SIXPENCE

THE REFORMED THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

EDITORS:

THE VERY REV. PRINCIPAL S. BARTON BABBAGE, M.A., Ph.D., Th.D., Melbourne.

THE REV. ROBERT SWANTON, M.A., B.D., Melbourne.

ASSOCIATE EDITORS:

THE REV. JOHN AITKEN, B.A., B.D., Bendigo, Vic.

THE REV. J. A. MUNRO FORD, B.A., B.D., Ph.D., Adelaide.

THE REV. M. W. J. GEURSEN, B.A., B.D., Melbourne.

THE VEN. ARCHDEACON T. C. HAMMOND, M.A., Th.D., Sydney.

THE REV. PROFESSOR JOHN HENDERSON, M.A., Ph.D., Dunedin.

THE REV. D. BROUGHTON KNOX, B.A., B.D., M.Th., D.Phil., Sydney.

THE REV. PROFESSOR JOHN McINTYRE, M.A., B.D., D.Litt., Sydney.

THE REV. ALLAN MacKILLOP, B.A., B.D., Brisbane.

THE REV. NEIL MacLEOD, M.A., B.D., Hamilton, Vic.

THE REV. L. L. MORRIS, B.Sc., B.D., M.Th., Ph.D., Melbourne.

THE REV. PROFESSOR J. F. PETER, B.A., B.D., Dip.Ed., Brisbane.

Contributors enjoy reasonable liberty in the exposition of the Christian Faith. The Editors are not responsible for every opinion that may be expressed.

ISSUED THRICE YEARLY

Communications and Subscriptions should be forwarded to the Editors, The Manse, 304 Glenferrie Road, Hawthorn, Melbourne, E.2. Subscribers in New Zealand should forward their subscriptions to the Presbyterian Bookroom, P.O. Box 389, Dunedin.

Annual Subscription:
Seven Shillings and Sixpence (Foreign, 8/-), post free.

THE
REFORMED
THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

Vol. XIII, No. 3 OCTOBER, 1954

Theology and Exegesis

The present emphasis in scriptural studies, noticeably New Testament studies, is upon what is called "Biblical Theology," and the renewed stress on constructive theology has already produced some noteworthy writing. At the same time, a good deal of what purports to be "Biblical Theology" is hardly deserving of the adjective. Competent scholars have warned us that with the current pursuit of theology there must be no languishing of interest in the problems of critical and historical interpretation or in the groundwork of philology and lexicography. A wholesome regard for these things still belongs to the discipline of a theologian, and not even the high and altogether commendable objectives of "Biblical Theology" can absolve it from the prime obligation of faithful exegesis.

The conviction that in much contemporary writing there is a serious lack of sound exegetical foundation has prompted this article. The aberrations of lesser writers would afford abundant evidence of this, but it has been deemed more expedient to make the point by examining some passages from the works of an eminent theologian, Professor Oscar Cullmann, of Switzerland. The choice of Dr. Cullmann of course does not imply that he is regarded as being, in high places, by any means a lone offender. Far from it! It is gladly acknowledged that, not only by his important writings themselves but also by his permission for their translation which has made them more widely accessible, Dr. Cullmann has given fresh impetus to study in many directions; and one cannot fail to learn constantly from him, even in those places where there is disagreement.

Limitations of space have precluded longer discussion, and so extracts from three of his writings have been selected, partly because of the prestige their author deservedly enjoys, partly because, of the books referred to, all are available in English translations and two have

already been noticed favourably in previous numbers of this "Review." Criticism is ventured only on the basis of relevant New Testament evidence, and solely in the interests of exegetical fidelity. Every endeavour has been made to prevent brevity of quotation causing misrepresentation of Dr. Cullmann's argument.

I.

"The Earliest Christian Confessions," translated by J. K. S. Reid.

One example must suffice. On page 19 it is said: "One can deduce from the text of the Acts that at this time a form of rudimentary baptismal liturgy existed. The person baptized, or the person bringing him to baptism, put the question, already stereotyped in the New Testament: *Ti koluei?* 'Is there any ground for opposing the baptism of this or that candidate?' On the occasion of the baptism of the Ethiopian eunuch (Acts 8:36-38), the order of the liturgy appears quite plainly: the eunuch himself asks whether any hindrance to baptism exists."

But the evidence shows that, far from being a "question, already stereotyped," *Ti koluei?* occurs here only, and nowhere else in the New Testament. Surely any liturgical significance must be wished upon it. When the passage is approached in its setting without prejudice, we seem to have a perfectly natural enquiry whether there would be any difficulties to hinder his immediate baptism. (As R. B. Rackham pointed out, a strict Jew could have raised two objections: the Ethiopian was a Gentile and he was a eunuch.[1])

Nor is the case strengthened by its further elaboration in the Appendix (pp. 71 ff.) of the author's *"Baptism in the New Testament."* There, in addition to Acts 8:36, he also "chooses" Acts 10:47, 11:17 and Matthew 3:13f.,[2] and observes that "in these texts it is striking how regularly the verb *koluein*, 'prevent,' appears when Baptism is referred to" (p. 73).

The verb *koluein* occurs over twenty times in the New Testament, six of which are in Acts; while there are about four times as many references to Baptism. But not much "choosing" was required, for the four texts quoted are the only passages where there is any kind of conjunction between *koluein* and Baptism. In Matthew 3:13f., however, the verb is *diakoluein*, not *koluein;* it is found only here in

1. "The Acts of the Apostles" (Westminster Commentaries), p. 123.
2. He also gives a text from the apocryphal Gospel of the Ebionites. John sought baptism of Jesus, but Jesus "prevented" him.

the New Testament, and refers to John's hesitancy to baptize Jesus. Thus it has a special individual significance which cannot rightly be imported into other New Testament passages. Acts 10:47 and 11:17 are both connected with Peter's attitude to Gentiles who had already received the gift of the Holy Spirit. "Can it be," he asks, "that anyone should refuse *(kolusai)* the water, that these be not baptized, seeing that they received the Holy Spirit just as we did?" (10:47). What he means is that the Gentile question can no longer be raised; and this is borne out in the subsequent section, where he defends himself against those who question him for associating and eating with "men who are uncircumcised." Their baptism may be included in the wider issue, but it is this wider issue, and no mere liturgical formula, that is in Peter's mind when he is prompted to ask, as the outcome of his house-top vision, "Who was I that I should try to thwart *(kolusai)* God?" (11:17).[3] At any rate, there is nothing in these different circumstances to justify labelling the question either "liturgical" or "stereotyped."

Yet the following conclusion is put forward: "In every case, and whatever the conditions imposed, when conviction was reached that the candidate had fulfilled them, the declaration *nihil obstat* was certainly made before Baptism took place—*ouden koluei* or *exestin* as we read in Acts 8:37. These forms answer the question: *ti koluei* 'What hinders?' (Acts 8:36)" (p. 76).

All that is wrong with this conclusion is that it has no New Testament support. *Ouden koluei* is not found anywhere in the New Testament; and *exestin,* which occurs over thirty times, is found in a Baptismal context *only* in Acts 8.37—a verse of doubtful authenticity, found only in certain Western texts with some minor variations.[4] So that the general affirmations ("in every case," "whatever the conditions") are based ultimately on the solitary passage in Acts 8. Persuasive ingenuity can not be made to compensate for paucity of exegesis.

II.

"Baptism in the New Testament," translated by J. K. S. Reid.

The first chapter of this study deals with the Foundation of Baptism, with particular emphasis on the

3. "that he should not give the Holy Spirit to them that had believed on him"—so adds the Western text, which is here disregarded, although it was convenient for the interpretation of Acts 8:37 ("Earliest Christian Confessions," p. 19f.).
4. cf. footnote 3.

passage in Romans 6:1ff. and the meaning of Jesus' own Baptism. These two matters will here be considered.

A. Romans 6:1ff. and Baptism. Cullmann sets "the important doctrine of Baptism in Rom. 6:1ff." in the forefront of his study. Barth also speaks of "the basic passage in Romans 6:1f.,"[5] and many others regard it as a primary passage. The undue claims that are so often made on the passage will be refuted first by a direct negative and then by a brief constructive exegesis.

Romans 6 does *not* offer a "theological explanation" of Baptism, and it is improper to represent or to use it as such. Consideration of Paul's words *in their true context* should make it clear that in this section he is not setting out to discuss Baptism. At most he makes an allusive reference to suit his immediate purpose, an allusion which cannot rightly be turned into a general dogmatic statement or made the basic passage for such a statement. Consequently, the exaggerated emphasis given to these verses amounts to special pleading, and readily leads to the exclusion or minimizing of other aspects of Baptism as presented in the New Testament. The significance of Paul's reference here to Baptism must be determined, not by isolating a few verses, but from the words themselves and the context to which they inseparably belong.

Romans 6:1ff. marks a pause in Paul's argument, in order to meet an objection that the new life of grace is in practice an invitation to sin. To him that is unthinkable. He insists that the Christian is "dead to sin, but alive unto God in Jesus Christ." That is Paul's dominant theme here, *"dead to sin, alive to God,"* and he develops it unwaveringly.

To do this he offers three illustrations: (1) from Baptism, 6:3ff., (2) from Slavery, 6:16ff., and (3) from Marriage, 7:1ff. The illustrations are each introduced by a similar phrase, not used elsewhere in the epistle: *e agnoeite hoti* (6:3 and 7:1) and *ouk oidate hoti* (6:16), "do you need to be told this?"—yet each time, to ensure that there is no misunderstanding of what he is at, Paul *does* tell them. The rhetorical question serves in each case to draw attention to the specific application that is to be made, as it relates to the main theme. As Baptism unites us with Christ in His death, burial and resurrection, so we are in Christ Jesus dead to sin but alive to God. As Slavery binds us to the master to whom we belong, so we are made free from the mastery of sin to become servants to God.

---

5. "The Teaching of the Church regarding Baptism" (trans. by E. A. Payne), p. 11.

As Marriage Law ties a woman to her husband, but with his death releases her for union with another, so we by death to sin are discharged from the law, to be joined to another, even Christ. The passage 6:3ff., therefore, is not intended as a theological exposition of Baptism any more than the later verses are intended as a theological exposition of Slavery or of Marriage.

This is also borne out by the following observations: (i) There is no hint that this exhausts the symbolism, or that Paul would restrict its whole significance to that which here suits his immediate purpose. In Galatians 3:27, for example, he uses the metaphor of clothing. (ii) The ideas here set in relation to Baptism are used elsewhere without any such connection at all, e.g., "dying with Christ," Col. 2:20; "being crucified with Christ," Gal. 2:20 (cf. 5:24 and 6:14); "the old man," Eph. 4:22, Col. 3:9; "newness" *(kainotes)*, Rom. 7:6; and "walk" *(peripatein)* frequently. (iii) The emphasis of the terms *syn*etaphemen, "buried *with*," *sym*phytoi, "planted *with*," *syn*estaurothe, "crucified *with*," is strictly relevant to union with Christ, but the terms need to be forced into consistency with any other metaphor. (iv) The argument would still hold if the reference to Baptism were deleted, just as it would without the reference to Slavery or to Marriage.

Enough has been said, it is hoped, to indicate that Romans 6:1ff. centres round the recurring theme of "death to sin and life in God," which is at the heart of Paul's experience and thought, and that the reference to Baptism, along with the references to Slavery and Marriage Law, illustrates, but does not constitute, his argument. Such a reference, found only here and, even more briefly, in Colossians 2:12, should not be made determinative for the Pauline, much less for the New Testament, doctrine of Baptism. There is no reason for believing that the perspective of I Corinthians 1:17 has changed for Romans 6:1ff.

B. The Baptism of Jesus. Cullmann considers it "of the greatest importance" that the heavenly voice at the Baptism of Jesus (Mark 1:10 and parallels) "consists in a citation from Isa. 42:1" (p. 16). "The form of words . . . diverges from Isa. 42:1 only in one respect . . . Instead of *pais*, it is *huios* that stands here" (p. 17). "In the Semitic original he is designated as *ebed*, servant" (p. 17); and on this basis the Suffering Servant of Isaiah 53 is introduced. "Christ at his Baptism is not yet proclaimed King but only the servant of God" (p. 17).

But it is questionable whether the heavenly voice "consists in a citation" of any kind. There is most probably an echo of Psalm 2:7. But, as for Isa. 42:1, so far from "*diverging* only in one respect," the only *resemblance* is in the single word *eudokesa,* which *may* be an echo of *raseta,* "delighteth." To insist that *huios* (son) is the rendering of *ebed,* "servant," which the Septuagint properly translates by *pais,* quite unwarrantably removes the probable reminiscence of Psalm 2:7 in order to support the much more dubious Isa. 42:1. All the Synoptic Gospels and all the variant readings are unanimous in affirming the *Son*ship of Jesus, by using the unambiguous *huios,* "son," not *pais,* which might be "only the servant of God."

Further, having thus made *huios* equivalent to *pais* and so imposed Isa. 42:1 in order to invoke Isaiah 53, the author continues so relentlessly as to inform us (p. 21f) that "possession of the spirit," as cited in the second half of Isa. 42:1, "is prophesied *in the same verse* as the *suffering* Servant of God" (italics mine)—who does not appear until Isaiah 53!

The possibilities of such uncontrolled processes of exposition are of course endless.[6]

Scarcely better is the claim for support from the Fourth Gospel (pp. 20-21). Cullmann refers John 1:33 also to Isaiah 42:1, again without adequate reason; whereas it is far more aptly related to Isaiah 11:2 (cf. 61:1). In John 1:34, he rejects the better attested reading "son" (which accords also with what has been said above regarding the unanimous Synoptic evidence) in favour of the "elect," on which solitary word again to bring in the "servant." And to assert that the Baptist, when he declares that Jesus is "the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world" (John 1:29), "draws a conclusion from the heavenly voice" (p. 21), is surely to go beyond the evidence and simply beg the question.

Of a piece is the explanation of "Jesus' answer to the Baptist, 'to fulfil all righteousness,' Matt. 3:15." "At the moment of his Baptism he receives the commission to undertake the role of the suffering Servant of God, who takes on himself the sins of his people. . . . This means that Jesus is baptized in view of his death, which effects for-

6. An example is suggested, which does not seem an unfair parallel. By seizing on the one word "crossing," the crossing of the Red Sea in Heb. 11:29 could be made dependent on David's crossing the Jordan in 2 Sam. 17:22; by substituting "Bethlehem" for "Jordan," the incident could then be joined with David's request for water from the well of Bethlehem in 2 Sam. 23:15; and the matter concluded by attributing the two incidents to "the same verse."

giveness of sins for all men. . . . In this way Jesus' answer to the Baptist, 'to fulfil all righteousness,' Matt. 3:15, acquires a precise meaning: . . . Jesus will effect a general forgiveness" (p. 18).

This is no more than another in the mounting series of unfounded assertions which are constantly made without ascertaining the meaning of words or their proper context. Only *part* of Jesus reply is quoted, and not one word even of this is seriously elucidated. To say, "the word *pasan* is probably to be underlined," is a bald statement that conveys nothing; and the misapplication of Luke 3:21 is irrelevant. Even if *pasan,* "all, every kind" (of righteousness), be underlined, the underlining does not allow it to be replaced in effect by *panton,* to make it "that of the whole people." (See p. 18.)

To keep to Matthew's account, we are told that John's baptism is "unto repentance" (3:11). (Mark 1:4 adds "unto remission of sins.") When Jesus presents himself, John demurs, and Jesus' *full* reply is: "Suffer it now: for thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness" (3:15). Consideration of the whole saying then makes clear certain factors which have been completely ignored in the proferred explanation. *Houto,* "thus, in this way," refers to the immediate situation. *Prepon estin,* "it becometh," refers to the *fittingness* of Jesus action, not to its *necessity,* for which *dei,* "one must," is the word, as in Matt. 16:21. And since "us" must obviously include John, to whom the answer is addressed, he can scarcely be included as "effecting a general forgiveness." The reply may be paraphrased, "Proceed; for in this way it is fitting that we should carry out the whole religious obligation." No more must be read into it.

It is further asserted that the "explanation" that at the Cross "Jesus will achieve a general Baptism," as commissioned in his own Baptism in Jordan, "is confirmed by the meaning which the word *baptizein* has for Jesus. . . . For him, to 'be baptised' from now on meant to suffer, to die for his people." And this assertion is said to be confirmed by the sayings in Mark 10:38 and Luke 12:50: in each " 'be baptised' means just 'die' " (p. 19).

"From now on" is, of course, another precarious general conclusion of the kind already noticed, this time from a metaphor in two parallel quotations. Further, the inconvenient part of Mark 10:38, and its parallel in Matt. 20:22, are ignored, so that the selected phrase may be pressed into service. It is quite obvious that, in all these

passages, when Jesus speaks of "the baptism that I am baptised with" *and* "the cup that I drink," he is using metaphor. *Baptizein* was recognized as a metaphor of an affliction that "overwhelms" (as in Isaiah 21:4, LXX),[7] and there is no valid reason for departing from the obvious and generally recognised metaphorical meaning here. Moreover, it is only one of *two* metaphors: Jesus speaks of "drinking" as well as "being baptised." It is not permissible to choose one of two metaphorical allusions and, by disregarding the metaphor, to turn it into a factual statement of equivalence. For, apart from its *metaphorical* use, "to be baptised" has in itself no more connexion with death than has "to drink." Not even Cullmann, I fancy, would want to suggest that "eat and drink" in Luke 22:30 means just "eat and die," as acceptance of his argument would allow.

Despite its constant reiteration, the "general Baptism" in the sense proposed has not been shown to have any New Testament warrant.

III.

"*Christ and Time:* The Primitive Christian Conception of Time and History," translated by Floyd V. Filson.

The examination of the New Testament terminology for time, offered in the first chapter of this book, leaves much to be desired. As space will not permit more, I propose to consider the exposition of the term *aion,* using as a basis the three points of the summary given on page 48, from which quotations are taken unless otherwise indicated.

1. There is no New Testament warranty for the terms "endless," "unending," "without end," "unlimited," which are freely used in the discussion of *aion* on pp. 46-48. Their use seems to beg the question in ascribing to "eternity" the meaning of "endless time," as on p. 45 f., with which may be compared the statement on p. 62: "Eternity is the endless succession of the ages (aiones)." Besides, "eternity" is not a New Testament term, but admittedly a translation (see p. 45); and it is a translation which is not accurate because it includes this notion of "endlessness." *Aion* is rightly defined as "period of time," "age" (p. 45), but a "period" or "age" has beginning and end, even if its duration be "undefined and incalculable" (p. 45). "The ongoing of time" is certainly "better expressed" as a "series of limited world periods" (p. 46), i.e., a series of *aiones;* but to describe the series as "unlimited" is just once more

7. See also J. H. Moulton and G. Milligan: "The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament," p. 102.

to beg the question. The use here of "unlimited" probably arises from our difficulty of thinking of a beginning and an end of time. The New Testament, however, gives no indication whether the "series of limited world periods" is itself limited or not.

2. A similar complaint must be made against the assumption that "limited time" is to be identified with the "present" age, as that "which lies between creation and the eschatological drama." For, as already noticed, there are no grounds for asserting that any *aion* is other than "limited." It might be added, too, that the phrase, "the eschatological drama," apparently with particular reference to the Apocalypse (p. 40), needs some more precise explanation. (It is frequently mentioned throughout the book, but I can find no explanation beyond some hints on pp. 141-2.) Is the Apocalypse regarded as contemplating a final drama, or one of its acts?

3. From the foregoing it should be clear also that there are no "periods of time that are limited in one direction but unlimited in the other." More specifically:

a. The assertion that "the phrase *ek tou aionos*, 'out of the ages,' points back" to "the time that lies before the Creation," flies in the face of the evidence. Apart from anything else, the phrase is found only twice in the New Testament, in John 9:32 and Gal. 1:4. The proposed interpretation would render the first passage meaningless: "*Before the Creation* it was not heard that anyone opened the eyes of a man born blind"! And in the second, the *aion* is specifically characterised as "this *present* evil age" *(ek tou aionos tou enestotos ponerou)*, which *ex hypothesi* (see 2, above) is not before but subsequent to Creation. The phrase more relevant to the period in question, *pro ton aionon*, "before the ages," is not even mentioned.

b. Neither can it be claimed that "the coming age" is "unlimited" in the forward direction. The meaning of *aion*, as already pointed out, precludes the use of "unlimited." Nor is it even certain that "the coming age" is the last age, and so perhaps by implication "unlimited." For the New Testament speaks not only of "the coming age" *(ho aion ho mellon* and *ho aion ho erchomenos)* but also of "the coming ages" *(hoi aiones hoi eperchomenoi)* (Eph. 2:7); and not only of "the consummation of the age" *(he synteleia tou aionou)* but also of "the consummation of the ages *(synteleia ton aionon)* (Heb. 9:26).

There is therefore no justification for the later reference, in the same sentence where "eternity" is spoken of

as "everlastingly continuing time," to "the already established fact that the word used to express eternity, *aion* ('age'), is *the same word*" (italics original) "that is also applied to a limited division of time" (p. 62). The argument may have set out with this as its assumption, but it has failed to establish it as a fact.

Each of the passages examined occurs early in the work to which it belongs, and is regarded by the author as important for his argument. There is not the opportunity here to follow the further progress of each argument; but sufficient has been shown, it is hoped, to indicate in each case serious insecurity of foundation so far as it professes to rest on the New Testament, and to suggest that careful scrutiny is also necessary before accepting any additional conclusions which incorporate such argument.

The warnings mentioned in the opening paragraph must not be disregarded. As an effective expression of the Christian faith, "Biblical Theology" can be welcomed only when it offers what is as truly "biblical" as it is "theological." Brunner has reminded us that Theology is, essentially, the exposition of the Bible. We cannot expound the Bible unless our own ideas are subservient to it.

Stawell, Victoria. C. STEWART PETRIE.

The English Accommodationist Thinkers

"In England Episcopacy rested on a theological basis . . . but in Scotland the claim for divine right never came in theology to the surface." This, indeed, is true, a characteristic of England being the amount of sustained study that was put into the subject of church polity. For it was ever the proud boast of the Church of England that it was no mere offspring of the Reformation, that while, indeed, it was true to the New Testament, it was also in direct continuity with the Apostolic Church and the Church of the Fathers. It had thus the twofold feature of being governed by catholic principles and of being reformed. This line of argument could be illustrated from Cranmer, Jewel, Hooker, Field, Bramhall, Bull and many others. On principles such as these, argued the seventeenth century Anglicans, it was possible to rebut both Romanists and Puritans. Holding, too, a central position, they felt a certain kinship with both sides, afforded a home for men of varying convictions and—which is of interest to us—supplied a way of comprehension.

No doubt the claims made for Episcopacy differed in intensity from 'bene esse' to 'esse,' this difference being of supreme importance to the accommodationists. Bancroft it is who is usually claimed as the first to maintain the 'ius divinum,' but his language is not much stronger than that of Jewel and Whitgift. As against the Puritans his "Survey of the Pretended Holy Discipline" was a strong polemic, as was also Bilson's "Perpetual Government of Christ's Church" which appeared in the same year—1593.

In the year after the publication of Bancroft's and Bilson's books, viz., 1594 appeared Richard Hooker's monumental work—"Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity." Impossible it is to exaggerate the influence of this justly famous book. Admittedly, Hooker cannot be claimed as an accommodationist (Says Schaff: "Hooker has been claimed as a champion of the High-Anglican doctrine of episcopacy, and, hardly less confidently, by the other side as the advocate of the view that church government is a matter of expediency." See Schaff-Herzog.), nevertheless, his book was ever an inspiration to the school. The famous eulogy of law, for example, in the first book is clearly reflected in the "Irenicum" of Stillingfleet—who, too, could proudly quote a writer so aptly called "the judicious." It is, of course, possible to get the impression that Hooker stood for positions which effectively debarred accommodation. He does not speak too kindly of Presbyterianism (though he gave a generous and impartial appreciation of Calvin in his Preface); he claims Episcopacy to be in closest accordance with scripture, he rebuts parity. The first bishops, too, he asserts, were the apostles, and ordination was peculiar to the bishops. Like so many sixteenth and seventeenth century Anglicans, such as Whitgift, Sutcliffe, Bancroft, Bilson, Crakanthorp, Davenant, Jeremy Taylor, Laud, Thorndike, Cosin, Pearson, Barrow and Potter, he is much perturbed by the heresy of Aerius. Nevertheless, Hooker's arguments, in the main, were such as to encourage the accommodationists. He combats, for example, the view that "Scripture is the only rule of all things which, in this life, may be done by men." While, too, admitting scripture to be an infallible guide, he denies that it is the only guide by which men are led. Reason has its place—as also the concurrent instruction of all the sources of knowledge Providence has put at man's command. He carries the war into the enemies' camp by his description of the results that would follow the extreme Puritan position.

> "For in every action of common life to find out some sentence clearly and infallibly setting before our eyes what we ought to do (seem we in Scripture never so expert) would trouble us more than we are aware. In weak and tender minds we little know what misery this strict opinion would breed, besides the stops it would make in the whole course of all men's lives and actions."

In the third book the author deals with the view "that in scripture there must be of necessity contained a form of Church polity, the laws whereof may in no wise be altered." Now, in answering this, he does not insist that the polity of the Church of England is contained in holy writ, the merit of his argument being that he refuses to allow scripture to be made a code strangling growth and reasonable freedom. Things not commanded in scripture, he says, may still be lawful—indeed, the practice of the Puritans themselves admitted it. Although he believes Episcopacy to be scriptural, he does not refuse to the Scottish and the French Reformed communions the title of churches. While, too, he argues, Episcopacy may be apostolic and by divine instinct there is nothing beyond the power of the catholic church to change it. It is conceivable, Hooker argues, that local churches might have to act without bishops.

It is plain, accordingly, that Hooker was not narrow in his outlook and that his broad generalisations encouraged the accommodationists in their endeavours. In a word—and in pursuit of our present study—Hooker's importance for us lies in the fact that he was the representative of toleration in the field of ecclesiastical polity and the advocate of reason as against a narrow scripturalism. Here, indeed, was good soil for the promoters of accommodation.

The two great names which connect the Elizabethan days with those of Charles I are Andrewes and Overall. The former certainly claimed divine right for Episcopacy —nevertheless, he did not assert its indispensableness. Overall, on the other hand, claimed not only that the three orders were to be traced to divine inspiration, but the whole hierarchy.

Of more immediate interest, however, to our enquiry are the English divines of the Synod of Dort. The leader was Bishop Carleton who, however, from our point of view, calls for no special mention. The most eminent representative, undoubtedly, was Joseph Hall, then Dean of Worcester, whose "Episcopacy by Divine Right Asserted" was to set the claims of Episcopacy on a very high level, indeed—a scholar who knew how to use Clement and Ignatius to good effect. A moderate Calvinist, who sought for a mean

between Calvinism and Arminianism—later, indeed, the author of a tract on the subject "Via media, the way of peace"—he yet did not show the same desire for a via media as regards church polity. All the same, for us the most interesting figure is Bishop John Davenant. In many ways a tolerant man—kindly, indeed, to the Puritans—he yet made high claims in argument. For example, for him the question whether bishops and presbyters were a single order was a quibble, the bishop having the distinguishing notes of a unique authority, the power of ordination and a jurisdiction over clergy and laity. Despite these claims, however—and this is rather a puzzling fact—Davenant contrived to make himself an influence among the accommodationists. In his contribution to J. Durie's eirenicon, "De pace ecclesiastica inter evangelicos" (1634), he left, as Bishop Hall says (in his Peacemaker), "a Golden Tractate" as his legacy to Christendom. In a second treatise, included in the English translation of the Exhortation to Brotherly Communion (London, 1641), he treats as the three main difficulties the questions of (1) the Presence of Christ in the Eucharist; (2) the Ubiquity of Christ's Humanity and "the communication of properties;" (3) Predestination and Free Will. Notwithstanding these difficulties, acceptance of the Apostles' Creed, he felt, was a sufficient basis for communion, apparently not thinking the differences of Episcopalians and Presbyterians an insuperable difficulty.

But we must pass on, resisting the temptation to dwell on the wonderful galaxy of seventeenth century Anglicans, and confining ourselves to the names which have a bearing on our subject.

Jeremy Taylor, too, argued for Episcopacy on orthodox lines. His career in Ireland—it cannot be gainsaid—did nothing to give him a name for toleration—a curious commentary on the "Liberty of Prophesying" of 1647—"in which, suffering from intolerance, he pleaded against it, and advocated a theory of comprehension which he had not the power to put in practice. It was, in fact, an eloquent plea on behalf of deprived Episcopal Clergmen, based on principles broader than were sufficient to support their case alone, but which, when the tables were turned, he was not prepared to apply to Presbyterians." All the same, the "Liberty of Prophesying" was a real contribution to our subject, its plea—that the interference of the State should be exercised only when doctrines injurious to its

own well-being were publicly taught—having a strong modern flavour.

It is, however, to the Restoration and the period thereafter, that we must look for the principal accommodationist thinkers. Mention, for example, must be made of George Morley, successively Bishop of Worcester and of Winchester—one of those who, most unfortunately, had declined to sit in the Westminister Assembly, who yet, however, had his place at the Savoy Conference. It is true that he laid himself open to the charge of intolerance by his advocacy of such a modification of the Test Act as should compel sworn allegiance to the Church of England—on the other hand, he was the friend of Falkland, and later of Izaak Walton, and had the reputation of being no extremist. Such was the man selected by Clarendon to send over to England in 1660 to negotiate—in view of the King's return—with the Presbyterian party—who was, indeed, ready to advocate a reduced Episcopacy, if nothing better could be obtained.

> "I foresee, he wrote to Clarendon on May 4, 1660, the main difficulty will be touching their ordinations by presbyters without bishops, which we cannot acknowledge to be lawful, nor will they, I am afraid, be brought to acknowledge to be unlawful, and much less to be mere nullities. In this case I have thought of two expedients; the one that no notice be taken whether there have been any such ordinations or no; the other, that there may be an hypothetical reordination, by bishops, of such as were so ordained, which reordination, as it will be a provision against the nullity of such ordinations, so it will not conclude them to be nullities, but only irregular and uncertain. And this is much the better salvo of the two, if they can be brought to it."

The former expedient, it must be confessed, was doubtful morally, and the second, though attractive to many minds, not conscientiously acceptable.

Herbert Thorndike, we need not say, cannot be classed among the accommodationists, he being, as Stoughton asserts, "the most learned, the most systematic, and the most powerful advocate of Anglo-Catholic theology and High-Church principles in the seventeenth century." Nevertheless, like Ussher and Baxter, he had decided views on the moderation of primitive Episcopacy. The primitive bishops were "heads of presbyteries"—the power of ordination resting in the apostles and the presbytery before there were bishops, and in the bishop and the presbytery in common afterwards—an arrangement which came to be altered. Bishops, indeed, were not to act without their presbyters—but neither, of course, could presbyters act without their bishops. These broad views might have made

Thorndike highly favourable in the eyes of the accommodationists—nevertheless, it must be admitted, he had no liking for either Presbyterians or Independents. For all that, Thorndike—an idealistic rather than a practical thinker—longed for unity and appealed for the holding of a conference.

We must pass over the names of Bramhall and Cosin, the former strictly speaking—belonging to the Irish section. Both, needless to say, adhered to Episcopacy along orthodox lines, yet each was willing to meet good Presbyterians halfway. At the Restoration, for example, the former would have gone as far as possible to conciliate those who had been employed under the Presbyterian regime. As regards Cosin, Calamy relates an expedient to which the bishop was ready to resort in his endeavour to win over a Presbyterian called Frankland.

> "Bishop Cosin solicited him to conform, promising him not only his living, but greater preferment upon his compliance. Mr. Frankland told him that his unwillingness to renounce his ordination by presbyters made him incapable of enjoying the benefit of his favour. This engaged him in a debate with the bishop, that was managed with great calmness, and this was the result of it. His lordship condescended to ask whether he would be content to receive a new ordination so privately that the people might not know of it, and have it conditionally, with such words as these, 'if thou hast not been ordained, I ordain thee," etc. He thanked him, but told him he durst not yield to the proposal, at the same time assuring his lordship, that it was not obstinacy, but conscience, which hindered his compliance."

These "if" ordinations had a certain attraction for some seventeenth century minds—as, for example, Tillotson's. All the same, it is astonishing to see Cosin—an Anglo-Catholic—employing it. From the point of view of the accommodationists, however, the attitude of Bramhall and Cosin is interesting.

Timothy Puller who, in 1679, published his "Moderation of the Church of England" next commands our attention. This writer never ceased to emphasize the lenity of his church—which stood, he said, midway between ecclesiastical monarchy and Presbyterian democracy—to the dissenters.

Archbishop Sancroft is of interest to us as apparently the first Anglican to confer on the Protestant bodies in England the title "Reformed Churches." He was, however, very friendly in his attitude to the Protestant dissenters. Indeed, we can even claim him as of the number of the accommodationists, he being the author of a tentative comprehension, the details of which have been preserved to us by biographer, George D'Oyley. But little came of

this, Sancroft's character not being such as to beget it any popularity—"a dry, cold man, reserved, and peevish, so that none loved him, and few esteemed him," says Burnet.

We now come to the great names of Tillotson, Stillingfleet and Baxter—the last two, in particular, being brilliant stars in the constellation of the accommodationists. By this time, of course, the ideal of one English Church had had to be adandoned. No doubt the nonconformists, such as Baxter himself, consistently refused to create a schism, yet the separatists as a body had no such qualms. Toleration, therefore, had perforce to be the national policy—both church and state putting up with the existence of other religious communities besides the church. Nevertheless, the old ideal persisted—hence a crop of comprehension schemes and a golden age of accommodationists.

In many ways Tillotson was well suited to act as one of their number. True, he has studied at Clare Hall, Cambridge—a home of Puritanism—yet, personally, he leaned to the Latitudinarian school. The Cambridge Platonist school, too, including Cudworth, More, Smith and Wilkins, exercised no small influence over him—as did also Chillingworth. Actually, he appeared on the Presbyterian side at the famous Savoy Conference, though too young to take part in that assembly, and later, submitting to the Act of Uniformity of 1662. His ordination is rather a mystery but Tillotson, a prince of preachers, wielded an extraordinary influence. Says Burnet: "He was the man of the truest judgment and best temper I had ever known: he had a clear head, with a most tender and compassionate heart: he was a faithful and zealous friend, but a gentle and soon conquered enemy: he was truly and seriously religious, but without affectation, bigotry, or superstition: his notions of morality were fine and sublime: his thread of reasoning was easy, clear, and solid: he was not only the best preacher of the age, but seemed to have brought preaching to perfection." Like many of the accommodationists, of course, Tillotson was often misrepresented but was invariably patient and unresentful. "His tender method of treating with Dissenters," says Birch, his biographer, "and his endeavours to unite all Protestants amongst themselves, were represented as a want of zeal in the cause of the church, and an inclination towards those who departed from it. But how unhappily successful soever they might be in infusing these jealousies of him into some warm and unwary men, he still persever'd in his own way. He would neither depart from his moderation, nor take pains to cover

himself from so false an imputation." Tillotson, then, with such a varied experience of many schools of thought, was well fitted to take his place among the accommodationsts—the description of whose accommodations, however, we shall reserve to its proper place.

And now, despite the detractions of some, it is with the utmost reverence and appreciation that we come to the name of Edward Stillingfleet, one of the very greatest of the accommodationists, whose "Irenicum. A Weapon-Salve for the Churches Wounds. Or the divine Right of Particular Forms of Church-Government; Discussed and examined according to the Principles of the Law of Nature, the positive Laws of God, the practice of the Apostles and the Primitive Church, and the judgment of Reformed Divines. Whereby a foundation is laid for the Churches peace, and the accommodation of our present differences." published in 1659, with a second edition in 1662, was for long a text-book of the accommodationists. He was one of Burnet's Latitudinarians, was under the influence of the Cambridge Platonists, especially John Smith, was an excellent preacher of the essay-like type of sermon, with many characteristics of his own His style was flowing and lucid, free from rhetorical aid, making good use of illustration and of classical quotation, orderly to a degree. His style, indeed—

> "suggests always the lawn sleeves of the bishop or the pulpit of a university; it conveys the impression of being in full dress, and suggests brilliant auditories and outstanding occasions, and for this reason it lacks the familiarity of manner that is acceptable to the solitary reader, or the lowering of tone that is agreeable to the closet."

And now, let us turn to a brief account of the argument of this deservedly famous book. In his preface the author bewails the controversies of his day.

> "For our Controversies about Religion have brought at last even Religion itself into a Controversie, among such whose weaker judgements have not been able to discern where the plain and unquestionable way to heaven hath layn, in so great a Mist as our Disputes have raised among us."

His aim he declares to be—

> "to shew that there can be no argument drawn from any pretence of a Divine Right, that may hinder men from consenting and yeilding to such a form of Government in the Church, as may bear the greatest correspondency to the Primitive Church, and be most advantageously conduceable to the peace, unity, and settlement of our divided Church."

The things necessary for the Church's peace, he says, must be clearly revealed. It is not so, however, with the form of church government, otherwise there would not be the

present controversies. Apparently, then, Christ never intended any one form as the only means to peace in the church.

What, at any rate, is the nature of divine right? Right makes things either lawful or due, for the former a non-prohibition being sufficient, while for the latter express commands are required. What is the position as regards church government? Obviously, it is founded on the Law of Nature which is shown by such propositions as these—there must be a society of men for the worship of God, such a society requires to be governed in the most convenient manner, man being of a sociable nature and needing the improvement of religion. Further, according to Stillingfleet, the Law of Nature issues in a set of important truths—the superiority of some persons over others, for example, in power and order, the fact, too, that persons employed in the service of God must have respect answerable to their employments, the solemnity, also, of all rites and ceremonies—in addition, the necessity of a way to end controversies (this leading to a discussion of schism), the binding duty of those who are members of the church to abide by its laws and, finally, the necessity of offenders against such laws giving an account to their governors.

This brings us to the second part of the Irenicum. Hitherto, the argument has been somewhat philosophical and abstract—now, however, facing the question of Positive Laws, our author is more concrete and interesting. Has Christ actually determined the form of government by positive laws? To this highly important question he does not hesitate to reply in the negative.

The author, however, is not perturbed by the apparent uncertainty. It applies—without, it seems, any prejudicial effects—in many other departments of Christian life and thought—in questions as to the desirability or not of baptizing children, as to whether baptism be by dipping or sprinkling, as to whether participants at Communion be admitted by previous external examination or solely by personal desire, as to whether they partake kneeling, sitting or leaning, as to what form preaching, praying and singing should take—and so on. Positive law gives no guidance.

Further, it has to be remembered that the early church was a growing institution—how was it possible to set one form of government for what was merely in the beginning of an unknown evolution?

> "And this is the chief reason why the Churches Polity is so little described in the New Testament, because it was only growing then: and it doth not stand to reason, that the coat which was cut out for one in his infancy, must of necessity serve him when grown a man; which is the argument of those who will have nothing observed in the Church, but what is expressed in Scripture. The Apostles looked at the present state of a Church in appointing officers, and ordered things according to the circumstances of them, which was necessary to be done in the founding of a Church; and the reason of Apostolic practice binds still, though not the individual action, that as they regulated Churches for the best conveniency of Governing them, so should the Pastors of Churches now."

Plain, therefore, it is that a very considerable liberty is accorded the Church.

> "But methinks, these general orders and rules for discipline do imply the particular manner of government to be left at liberty to the Church of God, so that in all the several forms these general rules be observed. Whereas had Christ appointed a superior order to govern other subordinate officers and the Church together; Christs command for governing the Church would have been particularly addressed to them: and again, had it been the will of Christ there should be no superior order above the Pastours of particular Churches, there would have been some express and direct prohibition of it; which because we nowhere read, it seems evident that Christ hath left both the one and the other to the freedom and liberty of his Church."

The concluding part of the Irenicum is of fascinating interest because in it Stillingfleet carefully examines history with the purpose of corroborating his theory. He rebuts, for example, the idea that the apostles had provinces allotted them and that Peter was "Monarch of the Church." He favours, however, the view that church polity was largely influenced by the constitution of the Jewish Synagogue.

> "It is probable that the Synagogue form of Government was used by the Christians. And the suitableness of this Government to the Churches, lay in the conveniency of it for the attaining all ends of Government in that condition wherein the Churches were at that time."

Stillingfleet attacks the evidence adduced to demonstrate the superiority of bishops to presbyters. For example, in one passage he says—

> "And among all those fifteen testimonies produced by a learned Writer out of Jerome for the superiority of Bishops above Presbyters, I cannot find one that doth found it upon any divine right, but only upon the conveniency of such an order for the peace and unity of the Church of God."

Indeed, the facile way in which so many Anglicans spoke of the "testimony of the Fathers," and appealed to this infallible evidence as though it were easily obtained and invariably pointed one way, obviously annoyed our author. His own findings were very different—

> "I do as yet despair of finding any one single testimony in all antiquity, which doth in plain terms assert Episcopacy, as it was setled by the practice of the Primitive Church in the ages following the Apostles, to be of an unalterable divine right."

The author then discusses the evolution of church government in the post-apostolic age, and has no difficulty in showing there was no one settled form. The final division of the Irenicum gives an account of the judgment of the Reformed divines—English and foreign—a most interesting portion of the work, indeed, wherein he asserts that never did they conceive of any one form of church polity as being altogether necessary and indispensable. With the voice of appeal it is that Stillingfleet brings his memorable work to an end.

> "That Form of Government is the best according to principles of Christian Prudence which comes the nearest to Apostolical practice, and tends most to the advancing the peace and unity of the Church of God. What that Form is, I presume not to define and determine, but leave it to be gather'd from the evidence of Scripture and Antiquity, as to the Primitive practice, and from the nature, state, and condition of that Church wherein it is to be setled, as to its tendency to the advancement of peace and unity in it. In order to the finding out of which, that proposal of his late most excellent Majesty of glorious memory, is most highly just and reasonable. His Majesty thinketh it well worthy the studies and endeavours of Divines of both opinions, laying aside emulation and private interests, to reduce Episcopacy and Presbyterie into such a well-proportion'd Form of superiority and subordination, as may best resemble the Apostolical and Primitive times, so far forth as the different condition of the times, and the exigences of all considerable circumstances will admit.
>
> If this proposal be embraced, as there is no reason why it should not; then, all such things must be retrieved which were unquestionably of the Primitive practice, but have been grown out of use through the length and corruption of times."

Such, then, is the Irenicum, a work so astonishing in its grasp and learning that it seems well-nigh incredible that it was the product of a man but twenty-four years of age. Owing, however, to its importance I have deemed it imperative to give some brief account of its general argument. It is only fair to add that the author, according to some, in later years modified—if, indeed, he did not actually retract—some of his positions. This, however, appears only to have been temporary.

D. S. HOPKIRK.

Melbourne.

Book Reviews

TRADITION.

By O. Cullmann (Zwingli-Verlag, Zuerich), 1954, pp. 56.

This small work by the well-known Basle scholar appeared originally in French under the title "La Tradition" (Cahiers Theologiques 33, 1953) and it includes material that has been previously published in English in the Scottish Journal of Theology (June 1950: Kyrios as designation for the oral tradition concerning Jesus; June 1953: Scripture and Tradition). This material is, however, now presented in a revised form in view of certain criticisms which M. Danielou had advanced against Cullmann's argument.

The whole work defends the Protestant position concerning the relation of Scripture and Tradition in a spirit of irenic discussion which Cullmann pursues with his Roman Catholic friends. Cullmann is realistic enough to know that his arguments will not effect a change in the position of his Roman Catholic friends, but he believes in the intrinsic value of such peaceful discussion of an admittedly controversial subject.

In his treatment of the subject Cullman distinguishes between "apostolic" tradition and "ecclesiastical" tradition; he obviously prefers these two terms to the conventional opposites of scripture and tradition. Chronologically he draws the dividing line between these two traditions at A.D. 70 or 80. He assumes that about this time the last apostle will have died (the date is naturally only an approximation). An apostle, in Cullmann's definition, is an eye-witness of the resurrection, and the material embodied in the "apostolic" tradition has been communicated to these eye-witnesses in a process of immediate revelation by the Kyrios or exalted Lord. This "immediacy" of communication constitutes the unique character of the apostolic tradition and sets it apart from all following tradition, which Cullmann designates as "ecclesiastical" tradition. The former is superior to the latter and constitutes its norm by which it is judged. The recognition of this qualitative difference between these two traditions indicates, in Cullmann's view ,the Protestant position over against the Roman Catholic position.

Cullmann's presentation of the subject is stimulating and provocative, but is it not without its defects? First, Cullmann moves uneasily between a "Protestant" insistance on the uniqueness of Scripture as norm of the ecclesiastical Tradition and a "Roman" recognition of the positive value of tradition. It is difficult to see why the line of demarkation between "apostolic" and "ecclesiastical" tradition should be quite as rigid as Cullmann insists it is, when at the same time it is emphatically stated by him that both traditions are the work of the Holy Spirit and that both have their place in the "Heilsgeschichte." Cullmann tries to extricate himself from this difficulty by the assertion that the quantity of human error surpasses in "ecclesiastical" tradition the amount admittedly present in "apostolic" tradition. While in the latter it has been kept within the limits of "the unavoidable minimum," it began to proliferate as early as the second century in such documents as the apocryphal gospels and acts as well as the legendary material Papias retailed.

Secondly, once the possibility of error is admitted within the apostolic "norm," the question arises, what is the norm of this norm by which we detect these errors? The apostolic norm obviously needs interpreting. In fact, we possess the apostolic norm only as interpreted norm, the interpretation being the work of the Church as she fulfils

her "Lehramt." This difficulty Cullmann has not faced; it has been admirably stated by Karl Barth in his Dogmatik, vol. I, 1,108, when he says that the exegetical operation through which the norm becomes norm for us exposes the Scripture to the continual danger of being taken captive by what Cullmann would call the "ecclesiastical" tradition.

Thirdly, Cullmann's use of the term "apostolic tradition" is not as precise as one might wish. He appears to use the term in a narrower and in a wider sense; in the latter sense the term seems to include the whole N.T. canon, while in the former sense it is confined to a certain body of teaching (paradosis) attributed to the Kyrios or exalted Lord. Used in its wider sense, the term "apostolic" is awkward as it would imply the apostolic origin of all N.T. writings, an implication which Cullmann himself would hardly be prepared to defend. Equally debatable is Cullmann's identification of the apostolic tradition with the Kyrios or the exalted Lord. His exegetical arguments in support of this thesis are not convincing. It is more than doubtful that passages like I Cor. 7:10 and 25 refer actually to the risen Lord. Nor can the "immediacy" of communication from the risen Lord to the apostle be inferred from Gl. 1:12 and I Cor. 11:23.

Fourthly, Cullmann does not appear to have made up his mind whether he will include in his "apostolic" tradition only such material as can be regarded with reasonable certainty as authentic or whether he is prepared to add also such material as was merely thought to be apostolic by the Church in the second century. This indecision becomes obvious in his treatment of the Apostolic Creed. There he is content to state that the Church of the second century recognised the "principle" of apostolic tradition when it accepted the Apostolic Creed on the ground that it thought the creed to be of apostolic origin.

Fifthly, Cullmann's distinction between "the times of the apostles" and "the time of the church" is regrettable, since it introduces a false alternative between the apostles and the church.

The above criticisms do, however, not wish to detract from the merit of the book. The whole question of the relation of Scripture and Tradition is full of difficulties, and it is not surprising that Cullmann has come up against some of them. Nobody who is interested in the subject can afford to ignore this book, and he will feel richly rewarded by reading it.

H. H. REX.

Dunedin.

DIE SYMBOLISCHER HANDLUNGEN DER PROPHETEN.

By Georg Fohrer. Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments. Edited by W. Eichrodt and O. Cullman. No. 25 (Zwingli-Verlag, Zuerich), 1953, pp. 107; Fr. 12.50.

Fohrer has a clear and logical mind, and the lay-out of his monograph is helpful to his argument. His work fills a real gap, in that the material he has collected in short compass is not available in any one book in any language. Professor Wheeler Robinson in England, and others on the Continent, familiarised us twenty years ago with the name "Prophetic Symbolism" for the acted parables of the O.T. prophets. These writers at the time made it clear that when Jeremiah, e.g., smashed the water-pot in the sight of the elders of Jerusalem, he was "releasing the energy of God to accomplish God's purpose." This thesis has had great influence on theories relating to doctrines of the Ministry, Word and Sacraments ever since then.

Now Fohrer examines this strange prophetic activity in the light of its backgrund in anthropology generally. Thereafter he lists and analyses all the instances of its use by the great prophets. Eliminating magical elements, and pure symbolism as an interpretation of their activities, he shows that "prophetic symbolism" was a method of preaching with power, because it was a union of word with action in the true Semitic manner of thinking. Moreover, the prophets acted thus because they were under the compulsion of God, and could no other. Their own feelings were of no account; yet they had the great satisfaction of seeing their human word becoming the vehicle of the divine Word, and so actually becoming "flesh" in a human situation.

While Wheeler Robinson's "Two Hebrew Prophets" (1948) virtually gives us in English the conclusion to Fohrer's thesis, yet here we have in compact form the steps leading up to the conclusion of Robinson's argument, and a sane discussion of the contributions of all those who have written on the subject.

G. A. F. KNIGHT.

Dunedin.

PURITANISM AND RICHARD BAXTER.
By Hugh Martin (S.C.M. Press), 1954, pp. 223; 15/-.

In this book Dr. Martin makes the plea "that we should cease to judge Puritanism by its peripheral extravagances and attend instead to its great central figures and listen to its great affirmations." He has therefore taken Richard Baxter, truly a great central figure, about whom there has been a refreshing revival of interest in recent years. He refers feelingly in his epilogue to the rude shaking of many standards and traditions of English life. If there is to be a restoration of moral discipline, a recovery of family loyalties and responsibilities, he declares, Puritanism at its best can show English-speaking people the way. One of the best chapters in this book deals with "The Essence of Puritanism," its emphasis on the Bible as the only rule of faith and conduct, its deep concern for worship to be offered in the beauty of holiness, its compelling sense of responsibility to God for every word and deed. Dr. Martin ably exposes the falsity of the charges against Puritans as being opposed to music, drama, the arts and recreation.

The author rather briefly reviews the history of the 17th Century, taking only facts well known to all students of the period, but showing how the Puritans have affected the religious life of England ever since. It is well that he makes it clear that Richard Baxter was a typical Puritan, and one within the Church of England. Indeed greater emphasis could have been laid upon the fact that the majority of the Puritans were within the Church of England until they were expelled in 1662. Baxter and many others, none of them Presbyterians, strove with might and main to reform the Church of England. Dr. Martin refers to these efforts to reduce episcopal authority and modify liturgical strictness so that the Church of England might have become truly comprehensive, fully national, and completely Reformed. If Baxter's ecumenical spirit and broad sympathies had prevailed his dream of Federated Parish Churches of England would have been realised and a revival of godliness without uniformity in church government and liturgical observance would have spread through England.

Dr. Martin refers carefully to the tragedies of the Restoration period. As he said, "We are still suffering to-day from the bitter fruit of that Bartholomew's Day" (1662). Baxter and the best of the

Puritans were driven from the Established Church which ceased to be national and became a persecuting sect. Dr. Martin is right in showing that the Restoration of the Stuarts was not due to a revulsion against Puritanism.

Baxter's outstanding earnestness as preacher, as pastor at Kidderminster, as controversial theologian, as an advocate of social justice, and, above all, as one who toiled and prayed for an "increase in godliness" in England, is clearly stressed. To read of Baxter's character and influence is to realise again how much our age needs the revival of the best Puritan virtues.

A. H. WOOD.

Melbourne.

THEOLOGIE DER LUTHERISCHEN BEKENNTNISSCHRIFTEN. By Edmund Schlink, Third Edition (Chr. Kaiser Verlag, Muenchen) 1948, pp. 435, D.M. 12.

It is to be regretted that this book has not yet been translated into English and published by one of the great Lutheran Publishing Houses in America. For it is more than a text-book for Lutheran students. It is the best introduction into Lutheran Theology which at present exists, and as such of great value for every theological student who wants to understand the Lutheran Church which thus far more than other churches has preserved the doctrinal heritage of the Reformation. Schlink began his spiritual pilgrimage as scientist and philosopher until, under the influence of Karl Barth, at that time at Muenster, he became a student of theology. As a decided and active member of the "Confessional Church" he was forced to give up his lectureship at the University of Giessen and found a sanctuary at the "Theologische Schule," a private Faculty connected with the Bodelschwingh Institutions of the Inner Mission at Bethel in Westphalia, until this school, a centre of the Confessional Church, was closed in 1939. He became a pastor at Bielefeld, and Fr. von Bodelschwingh, the leader of Bethel, made it possible for him to write this book which appeared in 1940, just before theological books were no longer allowed to be printed. Since 1946 Schlink has been Professor of Systematic Theology at Heidelberg and is well known in ecumenical circles. He belongs to those disciples of Barth who found the way, not only to Luther, but to the doctrine of the Lutheran Church.

Schlink's book is not a sort of commentary to the Augsburg Confession or even to the whole book of Concord, comparable to Barth's Gifford Lectures on the "Confessio Scotica." It is rather the first part of his lectures on Dogmatics. It was an event in the history of German systematic theology, a result of the new studies of the Confessions in the "Confessional Church," that a dogmatician ventured to go this unusual way of starting with the doctrine of the church instead of making his own philosophy the starting-point for presenting "dogmatics." This way corresponded to what the philosophers after the First World War in Europe called the "turn from the subject to the object." Whether Schlink's way is wholly successful can be seen only when, as we hope, his work on dogmatics will be published in its entirety.

The Introduction makes it clear that and why the Lutheran Confessions—the same would have to be said of the corresponding confessions of other Churches—cannot be understood as historical documents only. They claim to give, in essential points, the correct, and therefore binding, interpretation of Scripture. This claim may be rejected, but it cannot be passed by. The relationship between

Scripture and Confession is discussed in the First Chapter which makes it quite clear that Scripture is by all means the only source, rule and standard of doctrine for the Lutheran Church. If written to-day, the book would perhaps still more emphasise how the Confessions refute the idea of tradition as a possible source of doctrine which at present seems to find access even into some parts of the Lutheran Church, as though the Bible were only written tradition and the authority of the Scriptures were based on the judgment of the Church which established the canon, which is even according to the Vatican Council (Densinger 1787) a grave heresy. From what this chapter says about the nature of an ecclesiastical confession in the Lutheran sense it becomes quite clear that the confession of faith, deeply related to the confession of sin and the praise of God (cp. the biblical usage and the meanings of the Latin "confiteri"), wants to be nothing else but the sum total of the Gospel. Chapter II on "The Revelation of God, the Creator" presents the doctrine of the Confessions on the much debated problem of natural theology. It is most interesting to compare the doctrine on the lost image of God with the writings of Barth and Brunner. Schlink criticises Brunner's understanding of the traditional doctrine of original sin and the fall, as if this classical doctrine of the Reformation denied the actual character of all sin and minimised our responsibility. Over against Barth it is made clear what the Confession means that "a dim spark of the knowledge that there is a God" has remained even in man after the fall. The same chapter makes it clear that belief in God the Creator is always belief in Christ and in the Holy Ghost. The core of the Lutheran understanding of the Gospel is given in two chapters on "Law and Gospel" the distinction—not separation—of which was for Luther the mark by which a real theologian could be recognised. It is remarkable how the 16th century theologians have avoided the danger of trying to understand psychologically the relationship between justification, regeneration, sanctification. Luther's paradoxical understanding of the essential identity of forgiveness and regeneration has been preserved. Chapter V deals with Baptism and the Lord's Supper, avoiding a doctrine on the sacraments as such which never has officially existed in the Lutheran Church. It is impossible to go into details here, though this chapter might be of special interest to a Reformed reader. The Chapter VI on the Church starts with the contrast between the *regnum diaboli* and the Church as the *regnum Christi.* It presents the doctrine on the Church which as a great reality is hidden in, with and under the earthly ecclesiastical organisations. Chapters VII and VIII deal with "Secular and Ecclesiastical Authority" and "The Last Day." Chapter VII should help to overcome the popular prejudices as if Erastianism and adoration of the state had anything to do with the Lutheran doctrine.

How independent Schlink is from the Confessions themselves is shown in the appendix where he points out a number of questions which modern exegesis would put to the theologians of the 16th century and which have to be answered to-day. The work as a whole is by no means an uncritical glorification of the Confessions of the Lutheran Church. There are, of course, questions which must be put to the author from the Lutheran side, e.g., what the Confessions teach on Intercommunion, and whether he has fully understood the Formula of Concord. For the non-Lutheran scholar who is able to read German it is not only the best introduction into Lutheran theology, but also an encouragement to study again the Confessions of his own Church.

North Adelaide. HERMANN SASSE.

THE SELF-DISCLOSURE OF JESUS.

By Geerhardus Vos (Eerdmans, Grand Rapids), 1953, pp. 311; $4.

At the beginning of the present century it was widely held in critical circles that Paul gave a supernaturalistic and redemptive twist to the simple teaching of Jesus of Nazareth, and the cry was often heard, "Back to Jesus and the Gospels." That challenge was accepted by such conservative scholars as Geerhardus Vos and J. Gresham Machen and other representatives of the Princeton school of theology. In this volume Dr. Vos examines the Gospel records to see what was the mind of Jesus in regard to His nature and person and the purpose of His mission. It is a study of the Messianic consciousness of our Lord.

After an introductory chapter stressing the strategic importance and significance of the Messianic consciousness, Dr. Vos examines the various contrary positions which have been put forward—the outward denial, the agnostic position, the theory of prospective Messiahship, the hypothesis of a gradually developing consciousness of Messiahship in the mind of Jesus, and the view that the Messiahship was a purely formal conception in the religious life and work of Jesus. Then he takes up the different titles which Jesus accepted or applied to Himself, such as "the Christ," "the Lord," "the Son of God," and "the Son of Man," showing that each has a definite Messianic content. In the study on "the Son of God," which occupies three chapters, he shows that the title also indicates His essential and eternal deity which underlies His Messiahship. The study on "the Son of Man" refutes the popular notion that this title emphasises our Lord's humanity, and establishes that it is a high Messianic title derived from the vision in Daniel 7. The two final chapters maintain that the purpose of His Messianic mission is salvation, and this was accomplished by means of His death.

The whole work is characterised by a calm examination and penetrating analysis of contrary viewpoints and a careful exegesis of relevant Scripture passages. This has been a standard work of this subject since it was first published in 1926, and this new edition, edited with textual and topical indices and rewritten in more readable form by the author's son, Johannes G. Vos, should increase its popularity and usefulness among theological students.

Melbourne. W. R. McEWEN.

THE TRINITY IN CONTEMPORARY THEOLOGY.

By Claude Welch (S.C.M. Press), 1953, pp. 313; 18/-.

This contains a useful summary and important evaluation of the doctrine of the Trinity in modern thought. Whilst the nineteenth century, under the influence of Schleiermacher and Ritschl, reduced the doctrine to the second rank, more recent developments have tended to bring it back into the centre of theology. The most fully articulated position in the contemporary theological scene is the development of the social analogy by the Anglican school as the synthesis of the fundamental elements of revelation and hence the all-inclusive doctrine of the faith and the ultimate item of Christian theology. On the other hand the by far most detailed and elaborate statement of a doctrine of the Trinity in contemporary Protestant theology is the development of the psychical analogy by Barth as the analysis of the content of revelation and hence the immediate implicate of faith and the first item of Christian theology. "In this distinction," says the author, "lies the heart of the problem of the doctrine of the Trinity in contemporary theology" (p. 156).

Welch comes down heavily on the side of the Unity in Trinity. In the synthetic approach, he holds, the doctrine is not an immediate utterance of faith but only a combination of such utterances, and therefore of secondary importance. Further, he rejects the societal conception as almost completely disregarding the New Testament witness to the unity of God. The traditional word, "person," as savouring too much in contemporary speech of tritheism he would replace by Barth's phrase, "modes of being."

However, in way of defence of the Trinity in Unity, it needs to be said that it is extremely doubtful whether Welch's sharp separation between analysis and synthesis is legitimate, for a balanced doctrine requires both activities, and, in any case, synthesis may be as much an immediate implication of revelation as analysis. Again, what is admittedly "the ultimate and inclusive implicate" in theology is surely just as central as "the first item."

The author is fully aware of the dangers of tritheism in Christian thought and devotion, but is rather blind, which is not altogether surprising in his New England milieu, to the fact that the opposite tendency of Unitarianism has historically been the greater peril in the West. His position approximates closely to a kind of essential or permanent modalism (not manifestational and temporary as in the Sabellian type) which fails to comprehend that the patristic *persona* was in the words of Gore "already trembling on the verge of what we mean by person." However, he appears to make a rather surprising and strange concession to Hodgson's contention that to the Christian consciousness "each is an He, none is an it," when he admits that "it may be possible to speak of God as *threefold* (not three) as He and *one as Thou*" (p. 271).

It remains to be said that the volume, originally presented in the form of a Ph.D. thesis at Yale (where the author is now Assistant Professor in Theology) bears the marks of its genesis in that the greater part is given to the sometimes tedious summarising of the viewpoints of various theologians. Neverthless, it is extremely valuable to have this wide survey of recent Trinitarian thought brought within a single volume, and the critical insight evidenced should provide considerable stimulus in the contemporary scene.

Melbourne. R. SWANTON.

SHORTER NOTICES.

Joshua Watson, 1771-1855, by A. B. Webster (S.P.C.K., 15/-). Professor Norman Sykes, Dixie Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Cambridge, has succeeded in inspiring a generation of students with enthusiasm for historical study. Professor Sykes is himself the foremost figure in the field of English Ecclesiastical History, and he is directing his students into many fields of profitable research. This book is a fruit of his inspiration. It provides a fascinating and impressive introduction to the life of an outstanding Christian layman. Watson's relations with Broughton, first and only Bishop of Australia, are of particular interest. This volume provides a useful addition to the series being sponsored by the Church Historical Society.

Prophecy and Papacy: A Study of Lamennais, the Church and the Revolution, by A. R. Vidler (S.C.M., 25/-). These Birkbeck Lectures have all the marks of Canon Vidler's characteristic scholarship: encyclopaedic reading, immense industry, profuse documentation. No one can accuse Canon Vidler of shoddy workmansip: he gives the impression of having read everything that has been written on a

subject. And yet there is often a disappointing and tantalising feeling of inconclusiveness. This study is a revealing account of the spiritual pilgrimage of Lamennais, the French ultramontane, who began as a Papal defender, and finished as an apostate. The incidental light which is thrown on the Machiavellian machinations of the Papacy is not the least revealing feature of this unusual biography.

Preaching in a Scientific Age, by A. C. Craig (S.C.M., 7/6). This volume contains the Warrack Lectures on Preaching for 1953. Dr. Craig discusses such problems as Biblical Criticism and Miracles in relation to the task of preaching. He also discusses the relevance of the Doctrine of the Reurrection and of the Last Things. Dr. Craig illustrates his Lectures with copious quotations, and these quotations are not without their value. Dr. Craig is a liberal theologian, of whom it might be said, "Without a problem spake he not unto them."

The Doctor's Case Book in the Light of the Bible, by Paul Tournier (S.C.M., 16/-). This book compels comparison with Daniel Jenkin's "A Doctor's Profession." Dr. Tournier's book has the advantage of being written by a general practitioner, himself involved in the doctor's dilemna. The author has an intimate knowledge of the Christian faith, and he makes a real endeavour to examine all questions *sub specie aeternitatis.* The author is to be commended on a remarkable and unusual achievement. The warm evangelical note that appears on every page is particularly moving.

Church and State from Constantine to Theodosius, by S. L. Greenslade (S.C.M., 7/6). Professor Greenslade has a remarkable gift for displaying ancient ecclesiastical history in a contemporary setting. He did this very thing in "Schism in the Early Church": now he has repeated the same achievement in another connection. The Frederick Denison Maurice Lectures for 1953 deal with the problems of Church and State. The Fourth Century Conflict between the rival theories of Caesaro-Papalism and Dualism is well described. The result of this conflict was neither Caesaro-Papalism nor Dualism, but ecclesiastical autocracy. The relationship, in the twentieth century, between the Church and State, is still one of great complexity, and, with the growth of the totalitarian state, it has again assumed a terrifying relevance. This is a scholarly and valuable study.

The Christian and his Bible, by Douglas Johnson (I.V.F., 6/-). It would be unfortunate if readers were deterred from persevering with this book because of the painful inadequacy of the opening chapter. The reconstruction of the situation in the Apostolic Church is both naive and anachronistic. The remaining chapters, however, are rewarding and informative. Scholars will probably feel that the evidence is over-simplified, but the young Christian will find the arguments cogent and convincing.

S. Barton Babbage.

Interpreting Theology 1918-52, by R. J. Williams (S.C.M., 10/6). In this book Dr. Williams deals with the great problems prominent in recent theological discussion. He says he has tried "to state what these problems are, to show what theologians are saying in the attempt to solve them, and to indicate how a significant meeting of minds is leading to helpful results to-day." He has succeeded admirably in his self-chosen aim. The account is clear and helpful. The most notable omission, however, is the absence of any reference to the not inconsiderable activity of the conservative evangelicals. Nevertheless, this is a most valuable and comprehensive survey.

L. L. Morris.

The Biblical Doctrine of Man in Society, by G. Ernest Wright, Ecumenical Bible Studies No. 2 (S.C.M. Press, 7/-). A group of Biblical scholars in the Chicago area was invited by the Study Department of the World Council of Churches to prepare a document on this theme. The Professor of Old Testament History and Theology at McCormick Theological Seminary gives a unified presentation of the subject, basing his study on papers submitted and discussed by the group at seven two-day conferences spread over a period of two years. As a consequence we have a booklet of 170 pages in which is summarised most adeptly the mass of material which in recent years has been given us on the once corporate and personal nature of man's life as it is revealed to us in Holy Scripture. It is not possible Christianly to discuss either the problems of society or the nature and mission of the Church herself without taking into account the kind of material organised for use here.

The Evolution of the Christian Year, by A. Allen McArthur (S.C.M. Press, 15/-), consists of four substantial studies in the early development of liturgical practice: on Sunday, the basis of the Christian Year; on Christmas and Epiphany; on Good Friday and Easter (with particularly illuminating sections on the "formation" and the "deformation" of Lent); on Ascension and Pentecost. Dr. McArthur's mastery of the complicated mass of material, his caution in dealing with points where there is a tantalising lack of evidence, and his courtesy and clarity in discussing work of contemporary scholars in the same field, are all quite admirable. At first sight it is a book for the specialist; but it is more than that. It has been written with the clear intention of being of assistance to the Church of Scotland in her recovery of the Christian Year. It cannot help but be of assistance to those in any church who are concerned for the proper ordering of Christian worship.

J. D. McCaughey.

Faith and Justification, by G. C. Berkouwer (Eerdmans, $3). This is the third volume to appear in English in the series "Studies in Dogmatics," from the distinguished Amsterdam theologian. Here the thesis is cogently developed, on the basis of Scripture and in accordance with the Reformation Confessions, that *sola fide* is identical with *sola gratia*. The objections commonly raised—judgment according to works, the idea of reward, and justification in the Book of James—are competently discussed and effectively disposed. An interesting chapter is included on "Justification from Eternity," which deals with an important controversial issue in the Netherlands. Although the volume somewhat lacks the freshness of its companion volumes the author here provides a valuable contribution and helpful guide to this important subject.

The Philosophy of Revelation, by Herman Bavinck (Eerdmans, $3.50). The theme of this volume, a reprint of the Princeton Stone Lectures, 1908-9, is "to trace the idea of revelation both in its form and content, and to correlate it with the rest of our knowledge and life." The world—nature, history, culture—are meaningless without revelation, which, "while having its centre in the Person of Christ, in its periphery extends to the utmost ends of creation." The learned author brings great erudition to his task and although the lectures are dated by their frequent reference to the prevailing monistic evolutionary viewpoints of the time, the insights, incisively expressed, are often of continuing value. Thus, for example: "In all systems which identify sin with the substance of things, Creation is changed into a fall, and the fall is represented as the symbol of a remarkable

progress. . . . In reality, the whole order of things is thereby reversed; God becomes the author of sin, and the serpent the author of human progress."

What is Calvinistic Philosophy? by J. M. Spier (Eerdmans, $1.50). Here is a brief account of "The Philosophy of the Idea of Law" recently developed by H. Dooyeweerd and D. H. Vollenhoven of the Free University of Amsterdam. The mark of creation is its subjection to divine law which is expressed in fourteen distinct aspects of cosmic reality, passing progressively from the least complicated of number to the most complex of faith. Here and elsewhere there is dependence on the Kuyperian concept of sphere sovereignty but in the elaborated minutiae there appears considerable divergence. The bold claim is made that "the first Christian philosophical system has finally arisen," and all mediaeval and Reformation philosophers (even Kuyper and Bavinck!) are lightly disposed of as "synthesis philosophers." We await the appearance of Dooyeweerd's basic work, "De Wijsbegeerte der Wetsidee," in its English dress, before we can evaluate these high-sounding claims.

A Book of Personal Religion, ed. by N. Micklem (Independent, 7/6). Consisting of a short anthology culled from writers from Calvin to Newton, this small volume provides an outline of the "ascetical theology" of the Reformed tradition. All the extracts given are of considerable value. Of special interest and enlightenment are the quotations from Watts' "Guide to Prayers" with their wise counsel concerning the use and misuse of book-prayers and the significance of posture in our prayers.

An Introduction to the Old Testament, by E. J. Young (Tyndale, 18/6). We welcome the English edition of this volume of which Dr. H. H. Rowley has written: "Of the conservative books on this subject this is easily the best." The American edition was reviewed at length in our Vol. IX, No. 2.

Origen's Treatise on Prayer, by E. G. Jay (S.P.C.K., 27/6). The Alexandrian Father was not only a great philosophical theologian and biblical exegete but also a devout practising Christian. This Treatise, after discussing the theological basis and analysis of prayer, concludes with a detailed exposition of the Lord's Prayer. The main thesis of the work is the explication of words of an unknown origin: "Ask for the great things and the small things shall be added unto you; ask for heavenly things and earthly things shall be added unto you." Material blessings are interpreted by the allegorical method as typical of spiritual graces; thus the petition for bread is understood as a petition for the True Bread which is Christ. The smooth translation, with its copious critical notes, is preceded by a short account of Prayer in the Early Church and a section on Origen, in which the chapter on "Prayer" would be more aptly termed "Mysticism." The author rightly contends that Origen was not a mystic in that he gives no place to the feeling after passivity. This most useful work, making available a great but little known classic in English, well deserved the award of the London Ph.D.

R. SWANTON.

Book Reviews

Page

CULLMANN, OSCAR: Tradition 85
By the Rev. Professor H. H. Rex, M.A., D.Theol., Knox College, University of Otago.

FOHRER, GEORG: Die Symbolischer Handlungen der Propheten 86
By the Rev. Professor G. A. F. Knight, M.A., B.D., Knox College, University of Otago.

MARTIN, HUGH: Puritanism and Richard Baxter 87
By the Rev. A. H. Wood, M.A., D.D., Principal of Methodist Ladies' College, Melbourne.

SCHLINK, EDMUND:
Theologie der Lutherischen Bekenntnisschriften .. 88
By the Rev. Professor H. Sasse, Lic.Theol., S.T.M., D.Theol., Immanuel Theological Seminary, Adelaide.

VOS, GERHARDUS: The Self-disclosure of Jesus 90
By the Rev. W. R. McEwen, B.A., Melbourne.

WELCH, CLAUDE: The Trinity in Contemporary Theology .. 90
By the Rev. R. Swanton, M.A., B.D., Melbourne.

SHORTER NOTICES 91

W. D. VAUGHAN PTY. LTD. PRINT, 128 Denmark St., Kew.